DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 455 201 SP 040 123

AUTHOR Vinson, Kevin D.; Ross, E. Wayne
TITLE Education and the New Disciplinarity: Surveillance, Spectacle, and the Case of SBER.
PUB DATE 2001-04-00
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA, April 10-14, 2001).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Standards; *Accountability; Educational Change; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; High Stakes Tests; Public Education; Quality Control; Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Foucault (Michel)

ABSTRACT

This paper pursues the evolving relationships between Foucauldian understandings of surveillance (the disciplinary observation of the many by the few) and Debordian notions of spectacle (the disciplinary observation of the few by the many). It argues that education today must be understood according to a setting in which spectacle and surveillance come together, where discipline is established and maintained simultaneously as people and groups are monitored by both larger and smaller entities. The paper considers the mutual relationships between images of public schooling and operations of high-stakes testing, particularly regarding the degree to which both work to enforce, control, and discipline cultural knowledge and behavior. Using the contemporary commitment to standards-based education reform (SBER), the paper questions: (1) To what extent might contemporary K-12 education be understood in terms of a blending of surveillance and spectacle, and to what benefit? (2) Within what contexts and via what mechanisms does this merging occur? (3) What are the potential practical consequences of this arrangement? and (4) How might SBER illuminate the fusion of surveillance and spectacle in terms of causes, effects, contexts, mechanisms, consequences, critiques, and resistances? (Contains 62 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Running head: THE NEW DISCIPLINARITY

ED 455 201

Education and the New Disciplinarity:

Surveillance, Spectacle, and the Case of SBER

Kevin D. Vinson

University of Arizona

E. Wayne Ross

SUNY-Binghamton

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

K. D. Vinson

Vinson, K. D., & Ross, E. W. (2001, April). *Education and the new disciplinarity: Surveillance, spectacle, and the case of SBER.* Roundtable discussion presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association [Foucault & Education SIG], Seattle, WA.

SP040123

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

In this paper the authors pursue the evolving relationships between Foucauldian understandings of "surveillance" and Debordian notions of "spectacle." Using the contemporary commitment to standards-based educational reform, they address the following questions: (1) To what extent might contemporary K-12 education be understood in terms of a "blending" of surveillance and spectacle? To what benefits? (2) Within what contexts and via what mechanisms does this merging occur? (3) What are the potential practical consequences of this arrangement? and (4) How might SBER (as a case study) illuminate the fusion of surveillance and spectacle in terms of cause(s), effect(s), context(s), mechanism(s), consequence(s), critique(s), and resistance(s)?

Education and the New Disciplinarity:

Surveillance, Spectacle, and the Case of SBER[1]

> Antiquity had been a civilization of spectacle. *'To render accessible to a multitude of men [*sic*] the inspection of a small number of objects'* [italics added]: this was the problem to which the architecture of temples, theatres and circuses responded. With spectacle, there was a predominance of public life, the intensity of festivals, sensual proximity. In these rituals in which blood flowed, society found new vigour and formed for a moment a single great body. The modern age poses the opposite problem: *'To procure for a small number, or even for a single individual, the instantaneous view of a great multitude'* [italics added]. In a society in which the principal elements are no longer the community and public life, but, on the one hand, private individuals and, on the other, the state, relations can be regulated only in a form that is the exact reverse of the spectacle: 'It was to the modern age, to the ever-growing influence of the state, that was reserved the task of increasing and perfecting its guarantees, by using and directing, towards that great aim the building and distribution of buildings intended to observe a great multitude of men at the same time.' (Foucault, 1975/1979, pp. 216-217)

As Foucault suggests, both spectacle and surveillance can be and have been used in the establishment and maintenance of regulatory power. But whereas he characterized "ancient" civilization as a civilization of "spectacle" (control grounded in the observation of the few by the many) and "modern" civilization as a civilization of panoptic "surveillance" (control grounded in the observation of the many by the few), in this paper we contend that the two in fact have

merged (or that they at least coexist), creating, in effect, an even more problematic and insidious mode of disciplinarity.

Examples of both working contemporaneously (if not conjointly) include the present popularity (and power) of "tabloid" and "reality" television (e.g., *Jerry Springer* and *Survivor*)—examples of "spectacle"—and the parallel functioning of (for example) e-mail monitoring (e.g., the recently publicized efforts of the FBI) and "nanny cams" (i.e., Webcams that make it possible for working parents to observe the actions of their children's daycare providers)—examples of "surveillance." Interestingly, the news media provide examples of both—spectacle (a large number of people viewing a smaller number), for instance, in their increasingly intrusive investigation of individuals' private lives (e.g., politicians, Monica Lewinsky) and their evermore continuous coverage of such "media events" as the high profile criminal cases of former NFL players O. J. Simpson and Ray Lewis (what Rich [2000] calls the "mediathon"]—as well as surveillance (a small number of people viewing a larger number), for instance in their "investigative reports" or "hidden camera" documentaries of large (and often corrupt) organizations. Frequently, these spiral into a surveillance-spectacle-surveillance-spectacle chain.

In this paper, we argue that education today must be understood according to a setting in which spectacle and surveillance come together, a state of affairs in which discipline is established and maintained (simultaneously) as individuals and groups are monitored by both larger and smaller entities. We make use of standards-based educational reform (SBER) as an indicative "case" (especially vis-à-vis the conditions of curriculum standards and mandated high-stakes testing), one in which this form of disciplinary power relates dynamically with and to what we (can) know and how we (can) know it. In this instance, for example, state bureaucrats "monitor" school performance within a "micro" setting (surveillance) while at the same time the

"public" considers school performance (or "accountability") via media-reported (frequently as headlines) standardized test scores (spectacle). In the extreme, given the potential of new virtual and on-line, audio and visual computer capabilities, these (educational and social) circumstances make available a new disciplinarity, one in which regulation can occur via the absurd possibility of "everybody watching everybody all of the time," and one that signals a qualitative shift in the mechanisms of the gaze, one conceivable only in light of technological advances (e.g., the Internet, "hyperreality" [Steinberg & Kincheloe, 1997]) and changing political/cultural/economic relationships between the "public" and "private" spheres and between "corporate" and "individual" identities.

We intend first and foremost to demonstrate that with respect to contemporary education, disciplinary power (i.e., "disciplinarity") must be understood within a context defined in part according to the *convergence* of surveillance and spectacle (as opposed, that is, to either one or the other individually). We utilize the case of SBER to illustrate: (a) the mechanisms by which such a confluence of power-elements occurs; (b) the contexts within which such a state of affairs is made possible; (c) the extent to which this conceptualization might provide insights into accepted and prevailing pedagogical practices, viewpoints, and policies; (d) the potential practical consequences (i.e., those of surveillance, spectacle, *and* "surveillance-spectacle") of this disciplinary setting; and (e) the increased complexity and turbulence made necessary by this convergence of surveillance and spectacle in terms of the production, establishment, evolution, and maintenance of any effective mode (or modes) of critique and/or resistance. More precisely, we address the following questions:

(1) To what extent might contemporary K-12 education be understood in terms of a "blending" of surveillance and spectacle? To what benefits?

(2) Within what contexts and via what mechanisms does this merging occur?

(3) What are the potential practical consequences of this arrangement?

(4) How might SBER (as a case study) illuminate the fusion of surveillance and spectacle in terms of cause(s), effect(s), context(s), mechanism(s), consequence(s), critique(s), and resistance(s)?

Image and Education

Increasingly today conceptualizations of public schooling rest upon the influence of dominant and dominating *images* rather than on any more authentic understanding of the complex realities of classroom life. Based upon what we see in the movies and on television and are presented with in the mainstream "news" media we create our interpretations of what is, what was, and what should be. This especially holds true in the ever more powerful socio-cultural-political-economic-pedagogical settings of SBER (e.g., Vinson & Ross, in press; Vinson, Gibson, & Ross, 2001), most specifically, perhaps, within the current move toward high-stakes standardized testing, a collective regime in which both the cultural knowledge and the behavior of students, teachers, administrators, classrooms, schools, and districts are not only (in)validated but also disciplined. In sum, the convergence of a number of phenomena related to image and high-stakes testing, including various means by which scholars might seek critical and practical insight, the mechanisms by which image and high-stakes testing both reflect and are reflected by contemporary societal circumstances, the enforcing consequences of such actualities, and the techniques by which such statuses might be resisted define the scope of this paper's efforts.

We recognize first a certain "hegemony of the image" that mirrors and is mirrored by—made possible by and reinforced by/reinforcing of—several developments in contemporary US society, specifically within the realms of technology and globalization. It is, for instance, consistent with the advent of the possibility of 24-7 access to cameras, in terms both of *seeing* and of *being seen*. This emerges, for example, in the proliferation of Webcams, around-the-clock broadcast and cable (and satellite and Internet) TV, state-sponsored privacy-monitoring (e.g., the FBI's "Enigma"), the multiplication of media outlets, and "reality" television. Moreover, it is constructed within an economic environment of conglomeration and oligopolification, a setting in which media giants merge their abilities to even more strongly control access to both technology and the (re)production of, access to, and manipulation of public images (e.g., AOL and Time Warner).

Contemporary regimes of high-stakes testing must be understood within such contexts, as mutually (re)inforcing, and as specific instances of the hegemonic dominance of media images. For example, how many times do individuals and groups determine the "effectiveness" of particular schools by relying on reported test scores—*images*—whether or not they have any firsthand information on what actually occurs in any one or another unique and concrete school? Moreover, as public education increasingly comes to dominate US political discourse [e.g., Jones, 2001], to what extent do such standardization policies normalize universally the cultural and behavioral interests of the economic and culturally powerful, especially as "liberals" and "conservatives" continue to merge around a singular idealized view of schooling (e.g., President Bush's "No Child Left Behind"; see Vinson, 1999; Vinson & Ross, 2001)?

As society's rulers coalesce and more generally use both surveillance (the disciplinary observation of the many by the few) and spectacle (the disciplinary observation of the few by the

many) as conjoint means of controlling individuals and groups, high-stakes testing represents not only the plane on which the school-society link is played out, but also a reinforcing context within which the interests of the wealthy and powerful work to legitimize what counts as both knowledge and appropriate behavior, especially as national education policy continues to be determined by the representatives of elite cultural and economic ideologies (e.g., in post-*A Nation at Risk* commissions comprised of key corporate leaders [e.g., IBM's Lou Gerstner], union officials [e.g., former AFT chief Al Shanker], and politicians [e.g., the National Governors' Association] convened for the purposes of determining the *nature and meanings* of US public schooling). In effect, such powerful elites control not only public/media images of contemporary education, but also how they are (re)produced vis-à-vis the contents of "official knowledge" and "proper" pedagogical behavior.

In this paper we consider the mutual relationships between images of public schooling *and* the operations of high-stakes testing, particularly regarding the degree to which both work to enforce, control, and discipline both cultural knowledge and behavior. Moreover, we interrogate the extent to which both seek to "normalize" the interests of the economically and politically powerful as "correct." Drawing on the vast literatures surrounding, for example, the notion of *image* (e.g., Barthes, 1977 [on the "rhetoric of the image"]; Bakhtin, 1981, 1990 [on "chronotope"]; Boorstin, 1961/1992 [on the "pseudo-event"]; Baudrillard, 1995 [on "simulacra"]; and McLuhan, 1964/1994 [on "the medium is the message"]), *surveillance* (e.g., Foucault, 1975/1979), *spectacle* (e.g., Debord, 1967/1995), and high-stakes standardized testing (e.g., Kohn, 2000; McNeil, 2000; Ohanian, 1999), we pursue: (1) the relationships between images of schooling and the contemporary societal merging of surveillance and spectacle; (2) the means and mechanisms by which such relationships work to enforce certain dominant and

dominating norms; (3) the school-society relationship vis-à-vis high-stakes standardized testing; (4) the consequences of such conditions (e.g., regarding architecture [schools as casinos?] and pedagogy ["impersonal" "distance education"]), and (4) various mechanisms by which such circumstances might be resisted and/or transcended (e.g., Guy Debord's conceptualizations of *dérive* and *detournement*), including in terms of how they indicate the various problematics of everyday life (e.g., de Certeau, 1984; Lefebvre, 1968/1971, 1947/1992; Perlman, 1969; Vaneigem, 1967/1972).

Understanding the Contemporary Scene: Standardization & Image[2]

The contemporary state of the school curriculum—its appearance-of-uniformity-appearance-of-diversity paradox (e.g., Vinson & Ross, in press)—reflects in part two recent and evolving socio-pedagogical trends: (1) the contradictory commitment to both "standardization" *and* "diversity" and (2) the increasingly important convergence (or at least coexistence) of "spectacle" and "surveillance." On some level both work to create the conditions by and within which schooling broadly reflects and is reflected by the characteristics (i.e., political, economic, social, cultural) of the larger (global) society.

That those who run public schooling continue their call for "higher standards," "high-stakes testing," "accountability," and "competition" while simultaneously praising the merits of "individual" and "cultural" differences should surprise no one, and in fact mirrors and is mirrored by not only the current empirical pedagogical debates surrounding uniformity and diversity but also prevailing US societal conditions—especially those reflected *economically* vis-à-vis global, state-sponsored, corporate, "infotech" capitalism and *politically* in terms of an apparent merging of political independence toward a bland and stultifying "centrism" (see, e.g., the "New Democrat," the "Compassionate Conservative," the Blair-Clinton project of the "Third

Way," etc.). Taken together, these contexts produce an uneasy and ultimately false coalition of *sameness*, with the politically powerful claiming to promote the common ("mainstream") good while at the same time their corporate/financial allies and supporters pursue profit-seeking policies at the expense of authentic economic opportunity, social justice, meaningful democracy, the environment, and human rights. No wonder cynicism, "voter apathy," and electoral mistrust. With little real difference between the dominant Democratic and Republican Parties (see, for instance, the "lesser of two evils" mentality among many members of the citizenry and the tag-team effort to marginalize third parties), and with their joint endorsement by and of the elite corporate hierarchy, there seems indeed sometimes little or no room for the less wealthy, the less powerful, and the less well-connected.

Clearly, *educational* leaders, including those responsible for establishing, maintaining, and reforming(?) curriculum and instruction are to some extent beholden to the demands of multiple political interests (including those of *government* leaders who, in turn, depend on and benefit from the interests of the economically and culturally powerful, for example in terms of campaign contributions). Yet, these same educational leaders are influenced by (and thus beholden to) a range of additional constituencies. These include, among others, parents and students, teachers, scholars, community leaders, activists, and residents of local neighborhoods, many of whom hold little concern for the politically and economically mighty. That these various groups and individuals present and experience a vastly more diverse reality than that of those who represent the US/global corporate-state indeed is an understatement. Yet it explains, in part, the odd and conflicting dual commitments of today's public school managers, existing as they do between the two worlds of elitist-socioeconomic-competitive-standardization and the everyday experiences of grassroots community activism and pluralistic cultural diversity.

Perhaps more importantly, though, it hints at the necessary extent to which this paradoxical state of affairs can only be understood contextually.

The move toward curriculum standardization can be seen, of course, in the myriad "official" policy statements and content documents created and put forth by an array of professional academic organizations, for example those which seek control over the meaning or "nature" of social studies education—that domain of curriculum work historically charged with "democratic" and "citizenship" education (e.g., Center for Civic Education, 1991, 1994; Geography Education Standards Project, 1994; National Center for History in the Schools, 1994a, 1994b; National Council for the Social Studies [NCSS], 1981; NCSS Curriculum Standards Task Force, 1994; National Council on Economic Education, 1997). Though it signifies an attempt to mask any real paradigmatic conflict or struggle, ironically SBER (here, especially, curriculum standards and high-stakes standardized testing) may instead reflect a multiplicity of tensions and confusions over the relative place and meaning of not only the range of constituent school disciplines but also fundamental questions relative to purpose, content in general, instructional methodologies, and assessment (i.e., What is it that citizens "need" to know? How do/can they come to know it? and How can we be sure they have learned it?). As such, this issue—standardization vs. diversity—may in fact be related to and encompass an assortment of other continuous yet equally contentious and relevant issues in terms of curriculum design and development, including the degree to which curricula should be constructed at the "grassroots" level or "hierarchically," the extent to which *purpose* or *testing* should "drive" curriculum and instruction, the relative merits of "progressive" and "traditional" orientations, and the overall pedagogical balance between "discipline-centeredness" (or "disciplinarity") and "a/anti/interdisciplinarity."

At present, this move toward curriculum standardization represents the dominant, status quo viewpoint and its underlying and foundational aims (e.g., Levin, 1998; Tucker & Codding, 1998; for a general overview of national standards as an issue, see, e.g., Wolf, 1998). Its fundamental features include formal and official curriculum standards frameworks, of course, but also a hypercommitment in favor of high-stakes standardized testing and a one-size-fits-all view of classroom/school conformity. As indicated above, this perspective is manifested vis-à-vis a host of policy statements developed at multiple levels, including the national (e.g., Department of Education, 1991; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), the state (Finn & Petrilli, 2000), and the professional academic organization (e.g., NCSS Curriculum Standards Task Force, 1994). It grows out of the current "liberal-conservative consensus" among politicians, corporate leaders, the news media, and educational policy makers (e.g., apparent *liberals* such as Nash, Crabtree, & Dunn, 1997; conservatives such as Ravitch, 2000) that both "higher standards" (read SBER—curriculum standardization and high-stakes standardized testing) and greater "accountability" are *essential* to the well-being and strengthening of US public schools (note that both major party candidates supported "stronger accountability" and more standardized testing during the 2000 presidential campaign). It is grounded in formal reports such as *A National at Risk* and reflected, endorsed, and expanded in works of typically conservative (culturally and economically) scholarship (e.g., Hirsch, 1987, 1996; Ravitch, 2000; Ravitch & Finn, 1987; see also Vinson & Ross, 2001).

Though dominant and indicative of a powerfully elitist consensus, the recent move toward SBER must and can only be understood contextually and against certain overlapping and contiguous socio-cultural, economic, and political currents, including changes in technology, the advent of state-sponsored global-corporate capitalism, and the "triumph" of the US "one party

system." More precisely (and significantly), we must understand that SBER reflects and is reflected by such contexts as they produce/construct/create and are produced/constructed/created by a characteristic feature of 21st century life in the US: namely, the imperatives (in terms both of *desire* and *opportunity*) of *seeing and of being seen* (i.e., both *how* we are see and being seen and *that* we are seeing and being seen; one might consider related notions of the "cult of celebrity," Warhol's "fifteen minutes of fame," and Orwell's "Big Brother"). These imperatives induce a clear disciplinarity, a conformity, and a perceived necessity to standardize/become standardized.

So, specifically, what are these various contexts and changes? In terms of technology (*here* a socio-cultural change) one might consider, again, several fairly recent developments, including the advent of 24 hour per day/7 day per week television "broadcast" via hundreds of cable/satellite channels, the Internet, and the proliferation of such innovations as Webcams—making it possible, of course, both to see and be seen simultaneously and continuously. Economically—again, within the environment of state-sponsored, global, corporate capitalism—see, for instance, how daily, round-the-clock updates reveal the scope to which stock prices and market capitalization figures increase for financial "powerhouses" (or not) even in the absence of profit or short-term profit potential—here, apparently, corporate *image*, how such institutions are *seen* (their "get rich quick" possibilities and manipulations)—matter more than fundamental soundness or past and present performance (let alone social, political, environmental, and/or cultural *awareness* and *sensitivity*). Similarly, note how the current race to the "middle" waged between the major political parties (i.e., year 2000 presidential candidates Bush and Gore) depends less on any authentic issue advocacy and more on how they are *seen* (and how they themselves see things). In effect, this leads to the establishment of a one-party system in which

powerful Republicans seek to appease their Right wing (e.g., Patrick J. Buchanan, the Christian Coalition) while simultaneously staking a claim in the "center" (aka "compassionate conservatism"), and powerful Democrats do the same with respect to their Left wing (e.g., Ralph Nader, environmentalists; see the "New Democrat"). As a result, real difference is marginalized and traditional allies (e.g., Nader via the Democrats and Buchanan via the Republicans) are forced out and compelled to accept an existence *viewed* as extremist and non-mainstream. This would be, perhaps, not so problematic were it based less on *mere* image (i.e., polling data, focus group results, PR, advertising) and more on a heartfelt dedication to significant issues and differences. For both sides, however, the goal seems to be less one of defending and promoting the collective social good, and instead one of ensuring first *that* they are in fact seen, and second that *how* they are seen (Democrats *and* Republicans) is as "conservative" but not "too" conservative and "liberal" but not "too" liberal.

At heart, these contexts—socio-cultural, economic, political—(re)establish the priority of sight—the "gaze"—as a mechanism of discipline and social control. More specifically, they create and are created by the conditions within which the convergence of "surveillance" and "spectacle" occurs, and establish in part the setting for what might be called the "new disciplinarity," a mode of often subtle coercion grounded in the extreme potentials of continual seeing and being seen, of both surveillance *and* spectacle.

For Foucault, surveillance represented a disciplinary power built out of the (eventually automatic and invisible) possibilities of the many being visible to the few (a la the architecture of the modern prison created according to the design of Bentham's Panopticon). At present, elements of surveillance exist in such features of society as "Nannycams," "Carnivore" (the

FBI's e-mail-tapping framework), and "Echelon" (the government's [NSA's] program for monitoring virtually all worldwide telecommunications).

Spectacle, conversely, presupposed a mode of disciplinarity based on the processes of the few being visible to the many (a la the ancient architectures of theaters, circuses, and temples). Yet according to philosopher Guy Debord (1967/1995) in *The Society of the Spectacle*, it describes contemporary society as well, especially in that:

> The whole of life of those societies in which modern conditions of production prevail presents itself as an immense accumulation of *spectacles*. All that once was directly lived has become mere representation. (p. 12)

Further:

> The spectacle is not [merely] a collection of images; rather, it is a social relationship between people that is mediated by images….In form as in content the spectacle serves as total justification for the conditions and aims of the existing system. It further ensures the *permanent presence* of that justification, for it governs almost all time spent outside the production process itself. [Moreover, the] language of the spectacle is composed of signs of the dominant organization of production—signs which are at the same time the ultimate end-products of that organization. (pp. 12-13; see also Bracken, 1997; Debord, 1988/1990; Jappe, 1993/1999)

Although perhaps not as familiar as Foucault's (1975/1979) interpretation of "surveillance" and "discipline," the concept of spectacle has gained increase acceptance, notably with respect to aesthetics and "film studies" (e.g., Eilenberg, 1975; Matthews, 1975; Polan, 1986), although it has acquired some level of attention in educational theory as well (e.g., Coleman, 1987; Roman, 1996; Senese & Page, 1995).

What makes today unique, however, is the merging or at least coexistence of the two, making it *possible* and among some people (even) *desirable* to see and be seen continuously and simultaneously (i.e., because of the Internet and cable/satellite/wireless technologies). In the extreme, the potential becomes more real that society will (or at least *can*) be understood as nothing but a medium through which everybody *can* watch everybody all the time and across and throughout all space—nothing more than a totality of images and spectacular relationships. Standardization/SBER in fact represents the extent to which this setting occurs, and presents a case not only by which the surveillance-spectacle merger can be understood but also one that can itself be understood against and according to surveillance and spectacle. An example here of the workings of surveillance is the official "monitoring" of testing procedures; an example of spectacle occurs in the media reporting of test scores. Both, in the end, privilege image over authenticity and work as a means of social control, political/economic dominance, and conformity.

Although curriculum standardization represents the dominant, consensus view, and granting its status as a major public policy issue (e.g., Johnson & [with] Duffett, 1999), it has not remained without its share of critics (e.g., Kohn, 2000; Ohanian, 1999; Vinson, 1999; Vinson, Gibson, & Ross, 2001), most of whom have sought other avenues, including those comprising the notions of *diversity*. In many cases, these critiques have emphasized the nature of SBER as

oppressive (e.g., drawing on, for example, Freire, 1970 & Young, 1992), *antidemocratic* (e.g., drawing on Dewey, 1916/1966), and in contradiction with the demands of the *collective* good (for a discussion curriculum standards as oppressive, antidemocratic, and anti-collective good, see Vinson, in press).

SBER, Surveillance, & Spectacle

SBER—especially its high-stakes standardized testing component—exists within the complex intersection of surveillance and spectacle. The result is a situation, or set of situations, consistent with those characteristic of the larger society. Although the consequences of such a framework are critical, we consider in this section simply the extent to which, and the means by which, the SBER-surveillance-spectacle association occurs. We do, however, explore the potential consequences of such a complex below.

High-stakes testing represents a multifaceted setting of surveillance, in terms both of behavior and formal school knowledge. As both "gatekeeper" and (perhaps) "doorcloser," it works to ensure first that certain content is being "covered" (and thus *theoretically* "learned"). The "or-else" effect establishes the priority of that particular content (information, facts, skills, values, and so on) as well as the inferiority, unworthiness, and marginalization of other contents (and knowledges). Its operates as a "checks and balance" system of observation that seeks to privilege the dominant and formally created curriculum and related modes of instruction. It enables, in other words, curriculum managers to "see" whether and "how well" a prescribed program is being followed. Moreover, its works within a panoptic order such that teachers "survey" students, administrators survey teachers and students, and school boards (and other public officials) survey all of them, each in successive and more indirect rounds of disciplinarity. A la Foucault, the model attains a certain automaticity such that regardless of whether one knows

that an administrator is actually in a given hallway peering through a classroom window, the possibility always exists that he or she might be—thus, the system practically runs itself. Behavior is regulated similarly, in that test questions demand specific instructional orientations (teacher-centered, behavioral, etc.). As applied at the level of the body (individual as well as group), testing represents the managerial effort to mandate a precisely organized regime of pedagogical activity, a narrowing link between what can be known and, ultimately, what can be done.

This regime becomes spectacular as the relative position of the observer changes, such that it is not a single principal surveying a school or a superintendent a district, but a larger viewing public using its broader and collective gaze as a disciplinary mechanism. At the heart of this process rests various news and information media outlets who publish and publicize images of schooling such as test scores. Newspaper readers and TV news viewers represent a public "observing" schools, one that is intent on, moreover, influencing schools to perform—or conform—in a particular way or toward a particular ideal. The repercussions, of course, are great, affecting such factors as property values, reputation, the expansion of employment opportunities, and educational resources. This spectacularization of teaching and learning, SBER, has the circular effect of strengthening the conditions of surveillance: As the public views test scores as either too low or contributing to some "achievement gap," they pressure school and other public officials to do something. These officials, in turn, intensify their (and certain allies', including the business community and teachers' unions) control over curriculum, instruction, and assessment vis-à-vis greater and expanded degrees of surveillance (all of which the public "watches" to see whether or not it is effective—i.e., whether politicians and administrators deserve their continued support). All of this leaves schools, classrooms, teachers,

and students in the middle, caught within a spiraling surveillance-spectacle cycle. Discipline and conformity increase, or else no promotion, graduation, funding, and so on. The connection between school knowledge and economics magnifies. Standardization intensifies, a paradox given the contemporary commitment of US schools to democracy, equality, fairness, opportunity, and diversity. The connection between school knowledge and economics magnifies.

A further irony, of course, stems from the fact that this entire structure develops based on image. Both media and public, via test scores, create understandings grounded not in what actually occurs in schools and classrooms—nor on what teachers and students actually do—but on how this all is represented. Further, those responsible for surveillance—often located outside of schools—draw their conclusions about performance or achievement or effectiveness not on what takes place per se, but on whether standardized test scores rise or fall. Higher scores, all is well, lower scores, all is not well—regardless of the authentic actualities and experiences of school and classroom life.

Consequences

Many of the potential consequences of this SBER-surveillance-spectacle conglomeration are already well known, especially those related to mandated high-stakes standardized testing. As critics such as Haney (2000), Kohn (2000), McNeil (2000), and Ohanian (1999), among others, have pointed out, under such a regime both curriculum and instruction narrow, innovation declines, "achievement gaps" expand, and (perhaps most ironically these days) more children are in fact "left behind." And, as we have already pointed out, connections between formal school knowledge and the economy generally solidify (often via the involvement with politicians and educational managers of corporate and financial leaders). As we also noted earlier, there are, of

course, risks to the extent that SBER (at least curriculum standards) may be oppressive, antidemocratic, and anti-collective good.

Further, though, there are consequences more specifically connected to the association of and between surveillance and spectacle. The spiral or circular (if not convergent) and mutually (re)productive character of the relationship helps ensure (1) that both in fact are strengthened and (2) that (therefore) school discipline and enforcement (in terms both of content and behavior) are tightened and subsequently made more effective.

With respect to the quote by Foucault (1975/1979) with which we began this work, a somewhat unique potentiality becomes apparent, one not always addressed by educational scholars, yet one important nonetheless. It involves the necessity, form, function, evolution, impact, and meanings of *architecture*. Though the scope of this study extends principally only to schooling, certainly some of our conclusions apply as well to the broader society, especially to the extent that the broader society contextualizes, reflects, and is reflected by contemporary public education.

In some ways, the present spectacle-surveillance complex, with its associated contextual components of technological change and so on, makes traditional modes of architecture irrelevant. As Foucault discovered, specific modes of disciplinarity required or encouraged specific modes of architecture (e.g., spectacle—temples, theatres, coliseums; surveillance—the panopticonic prison [etc.]). But the modern evolution of observational technology changes all this. In fact, it creates and in part is created by at least two new modes of "architecture"—what might be called "teletecture" and "cosmotecture." The archetypes here are not the theater or the prison, but are instead, respectively though often mutual, the *Internet* and the *casino*. Teletecture represents the demolition of architecture per se. It is a disciplinary mechanism that requires no

walls—or in today's slang, no brick and mortar—because the possibilities of its gaze-based regulation is complete and absolute—without boundaries. With the advent of the Internet (and high-speed digital and wireless connections), Webcams, 24 hour per day access to the media, again the potential exists for a disciplinary means of control in that everyone *can* watch everyone all the time. Wireless technologies make particular space unnecessary, so that *any* available space will do. The implications here for education suggest an expanded role for distance education and a reduced role for the historical setting of the school, no longer required, of course, by the disciplinary demands of education (included those relative to SBER).

Cosmotecture presents a distinct yet related state of affairs in which gigantic buildings are created in order to regulate the behaviors of many individuals engaged in multiple activities—all under the gaze of cameras. Although, perhaps, today the casino best represents this spectacle-surveillance hybrid mode of gaze-based discipline, other examples might include the modern international airport and the shopping mall. In effect, each represents a miniature and self-enclosed world—a cosmos—where the activities of the many can be seen by the few, *and* where the activities of a few can be seen by the many. (Interestingly, we understand that a Website exists where surfers can view the operations of casino surveillance.)

Granting that both teletecture and cosmotecture present the merging or coexistence of spectacle and surveillance, they do nonetheless raise a number of interesting questions relative to the relationships between schools and broader societies. Most directly related to schooling, they suggest the possibility (which may or may not be feasible or likely) that powerful individuals and groups could standardize both knowledge and behavior without the need for any direct (unmediated by technology), person-to-person, human interaction (for good or for bad).

In addition, though, and maybe more problematic to some people, this spectacle-surveillance alliance signals a new relationship between *voyeurism* and *exhibitionism* (e.g., reality TV, Webcams, *Jerry Springer*, electronic eavesdropping, and so on). In such instances, groups and individuals expose themselves (to some extent as *images*, as *non-realities*), blurring the public and private, while simultaneously (although even this no longer need apply given Tivo and various recording and "downloading" technologies) other groups and individuals observe them solely for the purpose of *entertainment*—frequently built upon an underlying set of *economic* relationships. Questions arise, however, relative to the degree to which such relationships are voluntary, "honest," and "human." A certain tension exists, in fact, between a willing and an unwilling acquiescence, not all too different, perhaps, from the implicit and explicit deal made vis-à-vis institutional security cameras in which we sacrifice a certain degree of privacy for a certain degree of public safety. The surrounding issues, though, are certainly far from settled.

Resistance

The merging of surveillance and spectacle presents clear and unique obstacles for any sort of critical and pedagogical resistance, particularly as each (along and in combination) has infiltrated everyday life. It requires, in part, both a resistance to surveillance and a resistance to spectacle, and implies that we take seriously more traditional forms such as those available via the political process and those accessible via local grassroots organization as well. Modern discipline, following Foucault, suggests, for example, a continuing struggle against any and all concentrations of power. In practice, this can be observed on the part of teachers and students who have boycotted standardized testing and/or have refused to participate in its encompassing mechanisms (e.g., some students have worked to "sabotage" the system by "faking" scores or by

declining to "play" the tests by "opting out"). Such actions, of course, bring with them their own certain and unique risks.

Debord and his *Situationist International* (e.g., Knabb, 1981) colleagues created specific revolutionary techniques grounded in a variety of theoretical-practical understandings of spectacle and its effects. One, the *dérive*, literally "drifting," involves "a technique of transient passage through various ambiances [and] entails playful-constructive behavior and awareness of psychogeographical effects; which completely distinguishes it from the classical notions of the journey and the stroll" (Debord, 1981, p. 50). It is "A mode of experimental behavior linked to the conditions of urban society…" ("Definitions," 1981, p. 45).

> In a *dérive* one or more persons during a certain period drop their usual motives for movement and action, their relations, their work and leisure activities, and let themselves be drawn by the attractions of the terrain and the encounters they find there. The element of chance is less determinant than one might think: from the *dérive* point of view cities have a psychogeographical relief, with constant currents, fixed points and vortexes which strongly discourage entry into or exit from certain zones. (Debord, 1981, p. 50)[3]

The extent to which "drifting," the *dérive*, offers practical resistance techniques pertinent to schooling and SBER is an open question. It may offer some insight into *how* to opt out, boycott, and refuse, however. Psychogeography, as it were, may offer a rather novel means for understanding the effects of SBER, particularly high-stakes testing, as it exists and is practiced in its present form.

The second of Debord's techniques is *detournement*, defined as "the reuse of preexisting artistic elements in a new ensemble....The two fundamental laws of detournement are the loss of importance of each detourned autonomous element—which may go so far as to lose its original sense completely—and at the same time the organization of another meaningful ensemble that confers on each element its new scope and effect" ("Detournement as Negation and Prelude," 1981, p. 55). It is:

> Short for: detournement of preexisting aesthetic elements. The integration of present or past artistic production into a superior construction of a milieu. In this sense there can be no situationist painting or music, but only a situationist use of these means. In a more primitive sense, detournement within the old cultural spheres is a method of propaganda, a method which testifies to the wearing out and loss of importance of those spheres. ("Definitions," 1981, pp. 45-46)

What might be the meaning or the effect of "detourning" test scores or newspaper headlines about them? Of destroying—negating—their old meaning and creating a new one? Or, similarly, of taking images ostensibly about something other than test scores and "reworking" them, perhaps by changing captions, slogans, and so on? Detournement presents, perhaps, one of the more direct and possible challenges to the hegemony of the image, including that presented within the framework of SBER. Both dérive and detournement imply the dangers and possibilities of challenging standardization, testing, image, surveillance, and spectacle as each intrudes upon the human-ness of everyday and experiential life.

Summary and Conclusions

Such issues as surveillance, spectacle, and the related notion of "privacy" recently have gained an increased degree of notoriety (e.g., Calvert, 2000; Rosen, 2000), though in education Foucauldian perspectives have dominated (e.g., Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998). Still, there has been at least some discussion related to the idea of spectacle (e.g., Coleman, 1987; Roman, 1996; Senese & Page, 1995). With the continued evolution of audio, visual, and "virtual" technologies, however, we expect an even greater emphasis on not only spectacle, but on surveillance and their interconnections as well.

Further, especially given President Bush's commitment to testing and the ongoing liberal-conservative consensus around higher standards, the issue of SBER seems not to be going away. Hopefully in this paper we have at least highlighted some of the characteristics of disciplinarity within the current setting of surveillance, spectacle, and surveillance-spectacle. Moreover, we hope to have suggested a few of the contexts and mechanisms by which this setting has emerged and by which it is maintained, its consequences effected, and its powers reinforced. Finally, we hope that we have in some way illuminated SBER as an exemplar case of the merging of surveillance and spectacle and as a image-bound inducement for new modalities of resistance.

Of course, we encourage further investigation, especially theoretical extensions of our work—optimally, forms of inquiry drawn from a range of related disciplines—but also empirical studies into the causes, effects, contexts, mechanisms, and consequences of SBER, surveillance, and spectacle, including those aimed at creating a meaningful and sophisticated set of critiques and those dedicated to effective and human(e) methodologies of pedagogical resistance. Perhaps above all else, we hope that scholars will continue to ask the questions we sought to pursue.

Notes

[1] This paper was originally presented at a Roundtable discussion for the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA, April 2001.

[2] In this section we draw heavily from our previous work, especially Vinson and Ross (in press).

[3] The members of the *Situationist International* offered the following definitions related to "psychogeography."

> **psychogeography:** The study of the specific effects of the geographical environment, consciously organized or not, on the emotions and behavior of individuals.
>
> **psychogeographical:** Relating to psychogeography. That which manifests the geographical environment's direct emotional effects.
>
> **psychogeographer:** One who explores and reports on psychogeographical phenomena. ("Definitions," 1981, p. 45)

Readers should also refer to various entries in Knabb (1981).

References

Bakhtin, M. M. (1990). *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a prosaics* (G. S. Morson & C. Emerson, Eds.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barthes, R. (1977). *Image-music-text* (S. Heath, Trans.). New York: Hill and Wang.

Baudrillard, J. (1995). *Simulacra and simulation* (S. F. Glaser, Trans.). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Boorstin, D. J. (1992). *The image: A guide to pseudo-events in America.* New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1961)

Bracken, L. (1997). *Guy Debord: Revolutionary.* Venice, CA: Feral House.

Calvert, C. (2000). *Voyeur nation: Media, privacy, and peering in modern culture.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Center for Civic Education. (1991). *CIVITAS: A framework for civic education* (National Council for the Social Studies Bulletin 86). Calabasas, CA: Author.

Center for Civic Education. (1994). *National standards for civics and government.* Calabasas, CA: Author.

Coleman, H. (1987). Teaching spectacles and learning festivals. *ELT Journal, 41,* 97-103.

Debord, G. (1981). Theory of the *dérive*. In K. Knabb (Ed.), *Situationist international anthology* (pp. 50-54). Berkeley, CA: Bureau of Public Secrets. (Original work published 1958 in *Internationale Situationniste #2*)

Debord, G. (1990). *Comments on the society of the spectacle* (M. Imrie, Trans.). London & New York: Verso. (Original work published 1988)

Debord, G. (1995). *The society of the spectacle* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). New York: Zone Books. (Original work published 1967)

deCerteau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life* (S. Rendall, Trans.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Definitions. (1981). In K. Knabb (Ed.), *Situationist international anthology* (pp. 45-46). Berkeley, CA: Bureau of Public Secrets.

Department of Education. (1991). *America 2000: An education strategy sourcebook.* Washington, DC: USGPO.

Detournement as Negation and Prelude. (1981). In K. Knabb (Ed.), Situationist international anthology (pp. 55-56). (Original work published 1959 in *Internationale Situationniste* #3)

Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and education.* New York: Macmillan. (Original work published 1916).

Eilenberg, L. I. (1975). Dramaturgy and spectacle: A proportion. *Journal of Aesthetic Education, 9*(4), 43-53.

Finn, C. E., Jr., & Petrilli, M. J. (Eds.). (2000). *The state of state standards 2000.* The Thomas B. Fordham Foundation. (Available on-line: http://www.edexcellence.net/library/Soss2000/standards%202000.html)

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage. (Original work published 1975)

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Geography Education Standards Project. (1994). *Geography for life: National geography standards: What every young American should know and be able to do in geography.* Washington, DC: National Geographic Research and Exploration.

Haney, W. (2000). The myth of the Texas miracle in education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8*(41). (Available on-line: http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n41)

Hirsch, E. D. (1987). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Jappe, A. (1999). *Guy Debord* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Berkeley: University of California Press. (Original work published 1993)

Johnson, J., & [with] Duffett, A. (1999, September 30). *Standards and accountability: Where the public stands: A report from Public Agenda for the 1999 National Education Summit.* New York: Public Agenda.

Knabb, K. (Ed. & Trans.). (1981). *Situationist international anthology.* Berkeley, CA: Bureau of Public Secrets.

Kohn, A. (2000). *The case against standardized testing: Raising the scores, ruining the schools.* New York: Heinemann.

Lefebvre, H. (1971). *Everyday life in the modern world* (S. Rabinovitch, Trans.). London: Allen Lane/The Penguin Press. (Original work published 1968)

Lefebvre, H. (1992). *Critique of everyday life, volume I* (J. Moore, Trans.). London & New York: Verso. (Original work published 1947)

Levin, H. M. (1998). Educational performance standards and the economy. *Educational Researcher, 27*(4), 4-10.

Matthews, J. H. (1975). Spectacle and poetry: Surrealism in theatre and cinema. *Journal of General Education, 27,* 55-68.

McLuhan, M. (1994). *Understanding media: The extensions of man.* Cambridge, MA and London, UK: MIT Press. (Original work published 1964)

McNeil, L. M. (2000). *Contradictions of school reform: Educational costs of standardized testing.* New York and London: Routledge.

Nash, G. B., Crabtree, C., & Dunn, R. E. (1997). *History on trial: Culture wars and the teaching of the past.* New York: Knopf.

National Center for History in the Schools. (1994a). *National standards for United States history.* Los Angeles: Author.

National Center for History in the Schools. (1994b). *National standards for world history.* Los Angeles: Author.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC: USGPO.

National Council for the Social Studies. (1981). Statement on the essentials of the social studies. *Social Education, 45,* 162-164.

National Council for the Social Studies Curriculum Standards Task Force. (1994). *Expectations of excellence: Curriculum standards for social studies* (Bulletin 89). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

National Council on Economic Education. (1997). *Voluntary national content standards in economics.* New York: Author.

Ohanian, S. (1999). *One size fits few: The folly of educational standards.* New York: Heinemann.

Perlman, F. (1969). The reproduction of everyday life. (Available on-line: *http://www.pipeline.com/~rgibson/repro-daily-life.html*)

Polan, D. B. (1986). "Above all else to make you see": Cinema and the ideology of spectacle. In J. Arac (Ed.), *Postmodernism and politics* (pp. 55-69). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Popkewitz, T., & Brennan, M. (Eds.). (1998). *Foucault's challenge: Discourse, knowledge, and power in education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Ravitch, D. (2000). *Left back: A century of failed school reforms.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Ravitch, D., & Finn, Jr., C. E. (1987). *What do our 17-year-olds know? A report of the first national assessment of history and literature.* New York: Harper & Row.

Rich, F. (2000, October 29). The age of the mediathon. *The New York Times Magazine*, pp. 58-65, 84.

Roman, L. (1996). Spectacle in the dark: Youth as transgression, display, and repression. *Educational Theory, 38,* 95-109.

Rosen, J. (2000). *The unwanted gaze : The destruction of privacy in America.* New York: Random House.

Senese, G., & Page, R. (1995). *Simulation, spectacle, and the ironies of education reform.* Westport, CT & London: Bergin & Garvey.

Steinberg, S. R., & Kincheloe, J. L. (Eds.). (1997). *Kinderculture: The corporate construction of childhood.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Tucker, M. S., & Codding, J. B. (1998). *Standards for our schools: How to set them, measure them, and reach them.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Vaneigem, R. (1972). *The revolution of everyday life* (J. Fullerton & P. Sieveking, Trans.). (Original work published 1967). (*Available on-line: http://www.subsitu.com/kr/ROEL.htm*)

Vinson, K. D. (1999). National curriculum standards and social studies education: Dewey, Freire, Foucault, and the creation of a radical critique. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 23*, 50-82.

Vinson, K. D. (in press). Image, authenticity, and the collective good: The problematics of standards-based reform. *Theory and Research in Social Education.*

Vinson, K. D., Gibson, R., & Ross, E. W. (2001). *High-stakes testing and standardization: The threat to authenticity.* Burlington, VT: John Dewey Project on Progressive Education /University of Vermont. (Available on-line: *http://www.uvm.edu/~dewey/monographs/ProPer3n2.html*)

Vinson, K. D., & Ross, E. W. (in press). In search of the social studies curriculum: Standardization, diversity, and a conflict of appearances. In W. B. Stanley (Ed.), *Critical issues in social studies research for the 21st century.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Vinson, K. D., & Ross, E. W. (2001 March). What we can know and when we can know it: Education reform, testing, and the standardization craze. *Z Magazine*, pp. 34-38.

Wolf, R. M. (1998). National standards: Do we need them? *Educational Researcher, 27*(4), 22-25.

Young, I. M. (1992). Five faces of oppression. In T. E. Wartenberg (Ed.), *Rethinking power* (pp. 174-195). Albany: SUNY Press.